



Royaume du Maroc

Université Cadi Ayyad

Publication de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines - Marrakech

Serie: Colloques et séminaires N° 4

# Sacred Text Translation

## Proceedings of the First International Conference

### March 2007



Edited by

Almutarjim Translation Research Group

**Sacred Text Translation**  
**Proceedings of the First International Conference**  
**March 2007**

**Sacred Text Translation**

Edited by Almutarjim Translation Research Group

Publication of the Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Marrakech -  
Morocco

First Edition 2009

Registration of copyright : 0792/2009

Imprimerie El Watanya Daoudiate, rue Abou Oubaida cité  
Mohammadia - Marrakech

Tél : 05 24 30 37 74 Fax 05 24 30 49 23

**Royaume du Maroc**  
**Université Cadi Ayyad**  
**Publication de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines - Marrakech**  
**Serie: Colloques et séminaires N° 4**

# **Sacred Text Translation**

**Proceedings of the First International Conference**  
**March 2007**

**Edited by**  
**Almutarjim Translation Research Group**

# A Model for Metaphor Translation: Evidence from the Holy Quran

**Abdelhamid ZAHID**  
Cadi Ayyad University  
Marrakech, Morocco

## **Abstract**

*This paper is a further step for Zahid (2004) to build up a model for metaphor translation. This model applied to translation from Arabic into English, given the data from the Holy Quran it works with. Inspired, as it is, by some contemporary theories of translation, it tries not only to review, explain and criticize these, but to go beyond them to set up a comprehensive prototype for metaphor translation as well. In Newmark's and Dickins's models, two major references in this paper, I have focused on what I perceive as the metaphor technicalities overlap whose root cause seems to be the authors' reliance on rhetoric as a primordial criterion for the classification of metaphor. This model suggests that the classification of metaphor should be based on the translation perspective. Accordingly, metaphor can be classified as common or specific. A common metaphor is shared between two or more languages and cultures; whereas, a specific one is local and, subsequently, relative to a specific culture and language. In terms of translation, a common metaphor can be translated linguistically and culturally. A specific metaphor, however, should be reproduced. Unfortunately, in the latter case, culture may stand as an obstacle to the process of translation. The model I suggest looks up to drawing a clear-cut distinction between common and specific metaphors. Translation by means of metaphor seems to be the most relevant technique in terms of distinction.*

## **Western Theory of Metaphor**

### **Types of Metaphor**

**1- Fowler's typology:** metaphor in Fowler's typology is divided into **live** and **dead** metaphors. Live metaphors "are offered and accepted with consciousness of their nature as substitutes for their literal



equivalence" (1926: 348-49). A metaphor is called dead when the "speaker and hearer have ceased to be aware that the word used is literal" (1926: 349). Cooper adjusts the statement in accordance, thinking that "the more we forget that it is being used instead of a literal equivalent, the deader is the metaphor" (1986: 119). Basing his view on the consciousness / unconsciousness he qualified Fowler's approach by "amnesiac scale". It appears as if both the speaker and the hearer are affected by amnesiac disease. It seems that the process of distinction between dead and live metaphor in Fowler's typology is mental, depending upon the degree of consciousness/unconsciousness of the speaker & reader. From this angle, it is appropriate to consider it as a **"mental classification"**.

**2- Newmark's typology:** in this typology, metaphor is divided into six types;

**a- Dead metaphor:** According to Newmark, a dead metaphor is "where one is hardly conscious of the image" (1988: 106). He adds that this kind of metaphor frequently relies on the universal terms used to describe space and time such as field, line, top, bottom, foot, mouth, arm and so on.

**b- Cliché metaphors:** they are defined as metaphors "that have perhaps temporarily outlived their usefulness, that are used as a substitute for clear thought, often emotively, but without corresponding to the facts of the matter" (1988: 107). Newmark illustrates this type by the following example: "the country school will in effect become not a backwater but a breakthrough".

**c- Stock or standard metaphor:** It is "an established metaphor which in an informal context is an efficient and concise method of covering a physical and/or mental situation both referentially and pragmatically" (1985: 108), such as:

- Keep the pot boiling.
- A wooden face.
- All that glitters is not gold.
- I can read him like a book.
- A sunny smile.

**d- Recent metaphor:** It is a metaphorical neologism often 'anonymously' coined, which has spread rapidly in the SL" (1988: 111), such as 'pissed' for 'drunk', 'groovy' for 'good', 'spastic' for 'stupid'.

**e- Original metaphor:** This kind of metaphor contains “the core of an important writer’s message, his personality, and his comment on life” (1988: 112). Newmark deems such metaphors to be a source of enrichment in the target language.

**f- Adapted metaphor:** Newmark illustrates this type by the following examples: ‘the ball is a little in their court’, ‘sow division’; ‘get them in the door’. It is worth mentioning that no definition to this kind of metaphor has been suggested.

In terms of qualification, Cooper (1986: 119) qualifies Newmark’s approach by ‘geriatric scale’. The categorization into dead, clichéd, stock, recent and original metaphors seems to implicate age as the criteria of classification. Like a person, a metaphor approaches death as it ages. A close scrutiny reveals that the geriatric scale is not applicable to all of them. For instance, the scale of age is clearly visible in cliché and recent metaphors. On the contrary, original metaphor reflects the creativity of the writer; dead metaphor reflects the consciousness/unconsciousness of the reader; and stock metaphor reflects the analogy as a mechanism governing the relationship between tenor and vehicle. This variety of scales leads us, against cooper’s approach, to qualify Newmark’s typology as a ‘**multidimensional scale**’.

**3- Dickins’s typology:** Dickins’s typology is characterized by two stages: in the first stage, metaphor has been classified into dead and live metaphor and, in the second, into lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphor. He suggests the dead metaphors “are the kind of things which are recognizably metaphorical, but which are included as sense of words in dictionaries. By contrast, live metaphor may be similarly crudely characterized as the kind of things which are recognizably metaphorical, but which are not included as senses of words in dictionaries” (1998: 261-62). The lexical scale is implicitly applied in this classification. In the second stage, the lexical scale is clearly adopted when he divides metaphors into lexicalized and non-lexicalized. He believes “the importance of this distinction between lexicalized and non-lexicalized metaphors is not that it should be absolutely true, but that it provides a reasonable way in the great majority of cases of distinguishing two major classes of metaphor which...typically require rather different treatment in translation” (2002: 148).

**1- Lexicalized metaphors:** These categories are the “uses of language which are recognizably metaphorical, but whose meaning in a particular language is relatively clearly fixed... we may say that lexicalized metaphors are metaphors whose meanings are given in dictionaries” (2002: 147); such as ‘rat’ for a person who deserts his friends. This category includes three types of metaphors.

**a- Dead metaphor** is one which can not normally be recognized as a metaphor.

**b- Stock metaphor** is one that is widely used as an idiom.

**c- Recent metaphor** is a metaphorical neologism. (For more details, see Dickins 2002: 149).

**2- Non-lexicalized metaphors:** In this category of metaphor, “the metaphorical meaning is not clearly fixed, but will vary from context to context, and has to be worked out by the reader on particular occasions” (Dickins 2002: 147); thus, “a man is a tree” which may have different meanings according to different contexts. This category is consisted of conventionalized and original metaphors.

**a- Conventionalized metaphors:** This category consists of metaphors “which are not lexicalized (and not therefore be given in dictionaries), but do draw on either cultural or linguistic conventions” (2002: 149). Examples include ‘battle of wits’, ‘attack’, ‘lash out’ and so on.

**b- Original metaphors:** This kind of metaphors, outcome of the creativity of poets and writers exemplifies in such as “‘tom is a tree’... because they are not simply relatable to existing linguistic or cultural conventions. Original metaphors are difficult to interpret. More specifically, it is necessary to establish the ground from the context” (Dickins et al 2002: 150).

It is clear from the above presentation that Dickins’s approach reflects the **lexicological scale** in which the dictionary has a decisive role to make a clear cut between the two categories. In terms of qualification, Dickins finds that some explanations of metaphor propose “quite complex divisions between types of metaphor”. It seems that the source of this complexity is due to the diversity of scales adopted such as **mental, multidimensional and lexical**.



## Arabic theory of metaphor

### Types of metaphor

The classification of metaphor in Arabic theory depends on the tenor, vehicle and the ground. Many criteria have been applied such as the omission/non omission of tenor or vehicle, the morphological aspect of the word borrowed and many others as it is explained below.

#### 1- Classification based on tenor or vehicle

##### a- Omission/non omission of tenor or vehicle

We have seen above that metaphor is distinguished from simile by the omission of either tenor or vehicle. Based on this criterion, metaphor is divided into:

- **Explicit metaphor** الاستعارة التصريحية: the vehicle here is mentioned and the tenor is omitted such as رأيت أسدا 'I saw a lion'.

- **Implicit metaphor** الاستعارة المكنية: the tenor here is mentioned and the vehicle is omitted such as واخفض لهما جناح الذل من الرحمة 'and lower to them the wing of humility out of mercy'. (The Holy Qur'an, Al'israa': 24).

##### b- The Harmony/non harmony between tenor and vehicle

- **Harmony metaphor** الاستعارة الوفاقية: here, both tenor and vehicle are harmonious and logically linked such as أو من كان ميتا فأحييناه 'and is one who was dead and we gave him life'. (The Holy Qur'an, Al'anaam: 122). Here, the borrowed word فأحييناه is compared to the omitted tenor الهداية 'guidance'. The meaning of 'guidance' is harmonious with 'to give life'.

- **Disharmony metaphor** الاستعارة العنادية: here tenor and vehicle are disharmonious. The borrowed word ميتا 'dead' in the previous Quranic verse where it is compared to الضلالة 'going astray from the right path' stands as an illustration.. Here the two meanings are less harmonious than in harmonious metaphor.

##### c- The description associated with tenor and vehicle

- **Vehicular metaphor** الاستعارة المرشحة: here, metaphor is described with features appropriate to the vehicle such as the following line of كثير عزة:

ر متني بسهم ريشته الكحل، لم يصبر  
ظواهر سطاوي و هو القلب جارح

"She fires an arrow at me its plumes covered with kohl

It wounded my infatuated heart without harming my skin".

Here the poet compared his beloved's look with an arrow whose plumes were covered with mascara (kohl) used to make up the eyes. The plumes here are more pertinent to the arrow than to the eyes.

- **Topical metaphor** الاستعارة المجردة: here, more details about tenor are provided such as 'I saw a lion fighting the enemy with his sword'. Here, the sword is relevant to the tenor rather than to the vehicle.

- **Free metaphor** الاستعارة المطلقة: in this kind of metaphor no pertinent description is provided for tenor and vehicle.

**d- The borrowed word** اللفظ المستعار

- **Non-derived metaphor** الاستعارة الأصلية: here, the borrowed word is a generic name such as ظبية in the following line:

بالله يا ظبية القاع قلن لي: لبلاي منكن أم لبلاي من البشر

"By God, does of the forest tell me,

Is my beloved Layla a doe or a human being?

- **Derived metaphor** الاستعارة التبعية: here, the borrowed word can be a verb, adjective or a particle such as (يس: 52) "Who has raised us up from our sleeping place". (The Holy Qur'an: Yasin: 52). Here the word مرقد 'bed', derived from the verb رقد is borrowed for the grave.

## 2- Classification based on the ground

**a- Original metaphor** الاستعارة الغريبة: This kind of metaphor is produced by great poets and writers. It is also a source of enrichment for the language and culture. In Arabic tradition, the more original the metaphor is, the more beautiful it is. An instance in this respect is in Abuu Firas's line:

سألت عليه شعاب الحي حين دعا أنصاره بوجوه كالدينانير .

"The street all flood to him once he called

His supporters with faces as red as Dinars"

The meaning metaphorically conveyed here is that, red-faced from their heroic dauntless, resolute will to battle under their commander, the supporters dash in crowds to rejoin their commander's summon. Dinar is Arabic currency made from red gold.

**b- Ordinary metaphor** الاستعارة العادية المبتذلة It is an outspread metaphor, frequently used with a clear ground such as in رأيت ، بحرا ، أشدا ، شمسا 'I saw a sun, sea, lion'. Here, the sun stands for female beauty, the sea for generosity, and the lion for bravery.

The previous exposition seems to result generally in the agreement that, in Arabic theory of metaphor, the latter classification should be based essentially on its structural components, namely tenor, vehicle and ground. As such, Arabic theory of metaphor is principally structural.

Western theory, by contrast, is more interested in extralinguistic factors than in the structure of metaphor itself. Many criteria are used such as time, consciousness, originality, and so forth. Lexicalized/non lexicalized classification, however, is based on the role played, not by structure, but by the semantic distinctions provided by dictionary. This leads us to qualify the western approach by a 'multidimensional scale' and the Arabic one by a 'structural scale'.

### **Metaphor translation technicalities**

Least of the many aspects of the human being make-up in their differences metaphor reflects culture, behavior, language. That is why, metaphor, as it is, stands out as the most challenging element to translate into another language. In the translation of metaphor, we are not dealing only with language as a means of communication, but with a culture as an integral entity. Dagut echoes this point, believing that "since a metaphor in the SL is, by definition, a new piece of performance, a semantic novelty, it can clearly have no existing 'equivalence' in the TL: what is unique can have no counterpart. Here the translator's bilingual competence...is of help to him only in the negative sense of telling him that any 'equivalence' in this case cannot be found but will have to be created. The crucial question that arises is thus whether a metaphor can, strictly speaking, be translated as such, or whether it can only be reproduced in some way". (Dagut 1976, quoted by Bassnett 1991: 24). However, metaphor is not always a new piece of



performance, a semantic novelty since the same metaphor can be produced in different languages and cultures. Metaphors, then, can either be **common or specific. Common metaphors are shared by different cultures and languages. Specific metaphors are specific to a given culture and language.** A common metaphor has a tendency to be translated whereas specific one is to be reproduced.

### 1- Newmark's model

Newmark sets up some guidelines for the translator "to make an attempt to clarify each sentence that is grammatical but does not appear to make sense" (1988: 106). Also, the translator has "to tease out the meaning of each word in a figurative meaning by matching its primary meaning against its linguistic, situational and cultural contexts". (1988: 106). A translator is called upon to not bind himself within the grammatical structure and the denotative meaning, but dig beyond the first meaning into the 'meaning of meaning', instead. This can be illustrated by the following Arabic metaphor مالي أراك تقدم رجلا و تؤخر أخرى. If translated on the basis of the first meaning as 'why are you advancing one foot and delaying another' the utterance would be meaningless in English. An idiomatic translation such as 'you are at a cross roads' is meaningful in the target language since it reflects the uncertainty expressed in ST.

According to Newmark, even though dead metaphors can do without translation techniques as they are "not difficult to translate, they often defy literal translation, thus calling in for more choices" (1988: 106). As an instance, 'field of research' will translate as 'domaine' in French and حقل or مجال in Arabic.

In respect of cliché metaphor, however, Newmark suggests that there is "a choice between reducing the cliché metaphor to sense or replacing it with a less tarnished metaphor" (1988: 107). He adds further that a cliché metaphor can always be reduced "to sense or at least to dead metaphor" (1988: 107). Thus, 'a politician who has made his mark' will translate as 'politician qui c'est fait un nom' in French and إنه سياسي بنى اسمه in Arabic. The English metaphor in the example has apparently been substituted by another Arabic metaphor, but the most idiomatic translation is done through metonymy إنه سياسي ذاع صيته في الأفاق.



As for stock metaphor, Newmark finds them sometimes “tricky to translate since their apparent equivalents may be out of date or affected or used by a different social class or age group” (1988: 108). Yet, in order to surmount the setback, Newmark suggests that “the most common procedure for translating stock metaphors is to replace the SL image with another established image” (1988: 109). As an illustration, ‘all that glitters is not gold’ will translate as ‘tous ce qui brille n’est pas or’ in French and ليس كل ما يلمع ذهباً in Arabic. Stock metaphor “can sometimes be transferred by retaining the metaphor or converting it to simile” (1988: 111), for example, ‘il marche a pas de tortue’ in French will translate as ‘he is as slow as a tortoise’ in English and يمشي مشي السلحفاة in Arabic.

Concerning adapted metaphor, Newmark thinks that “it should, where possible, be translated by an equivalent adapted metaphor” (1988: 111). ‘sow division’ for instance, will translate as ‘semer la division’ in French and يزرع التفرقة in Arabic. Likewise, ‘get them in the door’ will translate as ‘faire le premier pas’ in French and أن تخطو الخطوة الأولى in Arabic.

It appears that original metaphor is the most challenging in translation since it represents the creativity of the writer. Newmark prefers that, although jarring with the style of the text, this kind of metaphor “should be translated literally, whether they are universal, cultural or obscurely subjective” (1988: 112). The purpose is to draw the reader’s attention and to enrich his knowledge. Furthermore, if the translation of an original metaphor appears obscure, the translator should “replace it with a descriptive metaphor or reduce it to sense” (1988: 112). In Newmark’s approach, no techniques have been suggested for recent metaphor.

## **2- Dickins’s model**

Metaphor downtoning is a general rule in Dickins’s approach devised to render Arabic metaphor into English. Dickins believes that “not infrequently Arabic ST metaphor appears too strong or too dense for equivalent forms of English writing and there is some needs to tone down the metaphors of the Arabic ST in the English TT” (2002 : 158). The Arabic theory of metaphor holds that density and strength are meant to be in Arabic metaphor. Unlike in simile, the fusion of both

tenor and vehicle into one entity in metaphor is the main motif behind the powerfulness felt by the reader.

The attempt to downtone Arabic metaphor in translation process may affect its mode and distort its original image. The specificity of Arabic metaphor needs to be respected in any translation process. In order to avoid potential jarring with the style of the TT, The translator has to compensate the powerfulness of metaphor by other means proper to TT.

Dickins sees in the matter of dead metaphor that "where an ST dead metaphor is being translated by a TT metaphor, the translator should bear in mind whether the TT metaphor is as dead as the ST: in some context it would be inappropriate to use a metaphor with more metaphorical force than the ST one; in others, this may be acceptable or even desirable" (2002: 150). For example, *لزم الفراش* will translate as "he took to his bed" in English and *قام من المرض* as "he recovered from his illness".

For stock metaphor, Dickins adopts Newmak's approach, suggesting the following techniques:

- A "stock ST metaphor can be retained as a stock metaphor having the same or nearly the same vehicle in the TL." (2002: 151), such as *استولت عليه* "possessed", *شاهدة على* "witnessed".

- A "stock ST metaphor can be replaced with a stock TT metaphor having a different vehicle." (2002: 151), such as *يحوم* "to hang around"

- A "stock ST metaphor can be converted to a TT simile. This technique works where, if translated literally into the SL, the TL metaphor appears too abrupt." (2002: 151), such as *يكسوه حزن* "as if clothed in sadness".

- It can be also "reduced to ground. This involves losing the metaphor altogether, and the emotional effect associated with it." (2002: 151), such as *دون أن يستبد به النعاس* "without feeling sleepy".

Dickins suggests that in the translation of recent metaphor into Arabic one is likely to reduce them to "stock metaphors, or perhaps to grounds. In translating into English, recent metaphors could be used where general requirements of register make them appropriate" (2002: 152).

Concerning the category of non-lexicalized metaphor, Dickins suggests techniques that vary according to whether or not the metaphor is conventionalized or original metaphor.

For the non-lexicalized, conventionalized metaphor he puts forward the following techniques:

- The conventionalized metaphor "can be retained as non lexicalized metaphor having the same or nearly the same vehicle in the TT" (2002: 152), such as غزو الكهرباء "the invasion of electricity."

- The conventionalized metaphor can also "be replaced with a non-lexicalized ST metaphor having a different vehicle" (2002: 152), such as لم تبرد نارها حتى الآن "the flames of which have not yet died out."

- Among the other techniques, "it is appropriate to replace the non-lexicalized ST metaphor with a stock TT metaphor"; such as البؤرة المتفجرة "flash point"; في هذه المنطقة البركانية القلقة "in this explosive and unhappy region".

- Concerning original metaphor, Dickins believes that its translation " by a stock metaphor in the TT will destroy the sense of originality, and therefore lessen the emotional force. It may be more appropriate to translate it by a non-lexicalised metaphor in TT having a different vehicle". (2002: 154) For that purpose, he suggests the following techniques.

- An "SL metaphor can be converted to a simile". (2002: 154); such as يشعر بأنه جوب عتيق "making him feels like an old discarded sock".

- It can also be "reduced to grounds". (2002: 154); such as شعب مصر العربي الذي يشعر نحو سوريا بأنها قطعة من قلبها "the Arab people of Egypt feel a strong affinity and deep affection".

- An original metaphor can also be "retained in the TT, but with the addition of the grounds on the topic. (2002: 155)"; such as وقد انتظر طويلا أن تبرز فوق صحرائه أنثى "he has been waiting for a long time for a woman to dawn over the desert of his life".

### **Evaluation of Newmark's and Dickins's models:**

A close scrutiny to these two approaches reveals the overlap between the techniques used. In other words, it is very difficult to draw



limits between the varied types of metaphors in the translation practice. The translation techniques of an original metaphor, for instance, may apply to a stock metaphor at the same time. In Newmark's approach, for example, the technique of literal translation is shared by both dead and original metaphor; the sense as a technique is also shared between original, cliché and adapted metaphors. Dickins's approach reflects the same outlook. Stock metaphor as a technique is applicable to recent, conventional and stock metaphor. The simile as a technique is also shared by original and stock metaphor. The purpose of this brief illustration is to justify the overlap of translation techniques, on the one hand, and to show the difficulty of putting a clear cut between kinds of metaphors in term of translation practice, on the other.

It seems the root of the problem resides in the classification of metaphor. As above mentioned, many dimensions such as time, conciseness, originality, lexicalized concur to classify metaphor, a thing which preoccupies researchers to find for each kind of metaphor its proper techniques. The overlap between techniques in the translation of different metaphors reveals the non importance of this classification in term of translation.

The fact that one technique is used in many kinds of metaphors suggests, from a translation point of view, that all kinds of metaphors are the same although they belong to different categories. Metaphor classification is established for other purposes than translation. In conclusion, **it is necessary to reclassify metaphor in terms of translation practice with the intention to create for each kind of metaphor some specific techniques.**

At the first stage, it seems that metaphor from a translation point of view is either **common or specific. Common metaphor means that it is shared between two or more languages and cultures; whereas, a specific one is local and relative to a specific culture and language.** A common metaphor has a correspondence in the target culture; whereas, a specific one has to be created.

In the light of this classification based on translation, the techniques of the translation of metaphor should be set. The ultimate aim of this approach is to examine whether the criteria of common and specific metaphors have some effect on translation techniques. In other words, to what extent can this classification be efficient in formulating techniques of metaphor translation? Our aim is also to achieve some



regularities which may minimize the clear overlap noticed in Dickens's and Newmark's approaches.

## **Evidence from the Holy Quran**

### **1- common metaphors:**

(وما يستوي الأعمى والبصير) فاطر: 19

Pickthall: The blind man is not equal with the seer.

Yusuf Ali: The blind and the seeing are not alike.

Hilali-Khan: Not alike are the blind (disbelievers in Islamic Monotheism) and the seeing (believers in Islamic Monotheism).

Shakir: And the blind and the seeing are not alike.

Sher Ali: The blind and the seeing are not alike.

Khalifa: The blind and the seer are not equal.

Arberry: Not equal are the blind and the seeing man.

Palmer: The blind is not equal with him who sees.

Rodwell: And the blind and the seeing are not alike.

Sale: The blind and the seeing shall not be held equal.

This SM can be considered as a common one. The usage of (أعمى) (blind) and (بصير) (seeing person) is used for (disbeliever) and (believer), respectively. The image behind this metaphor is that a disbeliever is a blind (أعمى) and deaf person, unable to see and follow the path of Allah. However, a believer (seeing person) has the faith that guides him to the right way. It is said in Arabic (ما أعماه!) (How blind he is!) to mean the blindness of the heart. In English (blind) is used also for the lack of mind discretion and perspicacity such as in blind faith and blind loyalty. It seems that the ground of this metaphor is shared between Arabic and English in terms of meaning and structure. A translation by the same vehicle sounds acceptable and accurate.

(أومن كان ميتا فأحييناه) الأنعام: 122

Pickthall: Is he who was dead and We have raised him unto life.

Yusuf Ali: Can he who was dead, to whom We gave life.

Hilali-Khan: Is he who was dead (without Faith by ignorance and disbelief) and We gave him life (by knowledge and Faith).

Shakir: Is he who was dead then We raised him to life.

Sher Ali: Can he, who was dead, then WE gave him life.

Khalifa: Is one who was dead and we granted him life.

Arberry: Why, is he who was dead, and We gave him life.

Palmer: Is he who was dead and we have quickened him.

Rodwell: Shall the dead, whom we have quickened.

Sale: Shall he who hath been dead, and whom we have restored unto life.

The SM (ميت) (dead) and (حي) (alive) fall among common metaphors and so do not seem to create major problems in translation process. The SM (ميت) is used for a disbeliever who is astray from the way of Allah. The second SM (أحييناه), however, is used to describe the same person after changing his faith, and becoming a good believer.

All the English translations seem to convey the SM meaning by the same vehicle. The common aspect between the SM and The TM is the use of (die hard) to mean the long time it takes to change someone to a new way of doing something. In this case, both of the two (SM) and (TM) can cohabite in harmony; language and culture, then, become one entity, and so make the task of the translator less complicated.

#### (يد الله فوق أيديهم) الفتح: 10

Pickthall: The Hand of Allah is above their hands.

Yusuf Ali: the Hand of God is over their hands.

Hilali-Khan: The Hand of Allah is over their hands.

Shakir: the hand of Allah is above their hands.

Sher Ali: The hand of ALLAH is over their hands.

Khalifa: He places His hand above their hands.

Arberry: God's hand is over their hands.

Palmer: God's hand is above their hands.

Rodwell: the hand of God was over their hands!

Sale: The hand of God [is] over their hands.

In the Arabic usage, the word (يد) (hand) is used to depict power and control. The discourse here is addressed to those who give pledge to Mohamed (ص) and through Mohamed (ص) to Allah. This entire scene happened under the hand (control, mandate and power) of Allah.

The common SM (يد) has been rendered systematically by the same vehicle (hand) in all the English versions. This SM does not seem

to create major problems as it shares the same usage with the English language where (hand) is used to express (control) and (power) as in (firm hand).

(وامرأة مؤمنة إن وهبت نفسها للنبي إن أراد النبي أن يستنكحها) الأحزاب: 50

Pickthall: and a believing woman if she give herself unto the Prophet and the Prophet desire to ask her in marriage.

Yusuf Ali: and any believing woman who dedicates her soul to the Prophet if the Prophet wishes to wed her.

Hilali-Khan: and a believing woman if she offers herself to the Prophet, and the Prophet wishes to marry her.

Shakir: and a believing woman if she gave herself to the Prophet, if the Prophet desired to marry her.

Sher Ali: and any other believing woman if she offers herself for marriage to the Prophet provided the Prophet desires to marry her.

Khalifa: if a believing woman gave herself to the prophet - by forfeiting the dowry - the prophet may marry her without a dowry, if he so wishes.

Arberry: and any woman believer, if she give herself to the Prophet and if the Prophet desire to take her in marriage.

Palmer: and any believing woman if she give herself to the prophet, if the prophet desire to marry her.

Rodwell: and any believing woman who hath given herself up to the Prophet, if the Prophet desired to wed her.

Sale: and any [other] believing woman, if she give herself unto the prophet; in case the prophet desireth to take her to wife.

This verse is about a woman who gives herself to the prophet Mohammad (ص) and the prophet accepts to marry her. The SM (وهبت) (give herself) derives from (هبة) (gift) which is (to give something without any return). This woman who gives herself to the prophet without any (صدق) (dowry) is an exception since in the Islamic tradition, the (صدق) is a must. The SM (وهبت) is translated into English by the same or nearly the same vehicle such as: (give herself), (dedicates her soul) and (offers herself).

The second and the third translation have failed to express the aforementioned meaning of the verse. The idea of giving herself to marry the prophet (ص) is absent in (dedicates her soul) and (offers herself) as a human being has become a present or a drink to be offered. The first translation, (give herself), however, sounds English in that,



when a women loves a man, she gives herself to him. What differentiates the SM from the TM is the Islamic legislation which regulates the conditions under which a woman gives herself to a man.

## 2- Specific metaphors

### 24 (واخفض لهما جناح الذل من الرحمة الإسرائاء: 24)

Pickthall: And lower unto them the wing of submission through mercy.

Yusuf Ali: And, out of kindness, lower to them the wing of humility.

Hilali-Khan: And lower unto them the wing of submission and humility through mercy.

Shakir: And make yourself submissively gentle to them with compassion.

Sher Ali: And lower them the wing of humility out of tenderness.

Khalifa: And lower for them the wings of humility, and kindness.

Arberry: and lower to them the wing of humbleness out of mercy.

Palmer: And lower to them the wing of humility out of compassion.

Rodwell: And defer humbly to them out of tenderness.

Sale: and submit to behave humbly towards them, out of tender affection

The wonderful image behind the source metaphor (SM) (جناح الذل) is a complicated challenge to render into the target language. The image in the SM (جناح) (wing) evokes that of the bird lowering its wings to overlap (يحتضن) its brood and, by that dint, delineates the image of a man as he bows (طأطأ) his head and shoulders in an expression of submission and humility. The tenderness expressed by the SM (جناح) (الذل), then, is the essence that should survive to underline the target metaphor (TM).

A brief glance at the English translation of this metaphor shows that this quintessence is achieved by retaining the same vehicle (wing of submission), (wing of humility) or by (ground) (submit to behave humbly), (defer humbly to them). Both of these two techniques fail to keep the same mood and spirit of the SM. A translation by corresponding metaphor in the target culture would be more successful.

### 37 (وآية لهم الليل نسلخ منه النهار، فإذا هم مظلمون) يس: 37

Pickthall: A token unto them is night. We strip it of the day, and lo! they are in darkness.

Yusuf Ali: And a Sign for them is the Night: We withdraw therefrom the Day, and behold they are plunged in darkness.



Hilali-Khan: And a sign for them is the night, We withdraw therefrom the day, and behold, they are in darkness.

Shakir: And a sign to them is the night: We draw forth from it the day, then lo! they are in the dark.

Sher Ali: And a Sign for them is the night from which WE strip off the day, and lo! they are left in darkness.

Khalifa: Another sign for them is the night: we remove the daylight therefrom, whereupon they are in darkness.

Arberry: And a sign for them is the night; We strip it of the day and lo, they are in darkness.

Palmer: And a sign to them is the night, from which we strip off the day, and lo! they are in the dark.

Rodwell: A sign to them also is the Night, We withdraw the day from it, and lo! they are plunged in darkness.

Sale The night also [is] a sign unto them: We withdraw the day from the same, and behold, they [are] covered with darkness.

Another sign for disbelievers is Allah's mightiness to create the world and His omnipotence to strip off (سلخ) the day of the night. The original use (سلخ) normally pertinent to animals is carefully chosen in this context to express the spread of darkness as the day strips of the night.

The following verse (فإذا هم مظلّمون) emphasizes this meaning by the use of (ف) which expresses (الترتيب) (succession in action) and (التعاقب) (succession in time), and of (إذا) which expresses the suddenness.

The techniques used in English translation of the SM (سلخ) remain the same vehicle (strip off) along with other alternative one such (withdraw, draw, remove). Both of the two techniques, however, fail to render the above mentioned meaning. The first technique (strip off) lacks the image behind the SM (سلخ) while the second one (withdraw, draw, remove) is simply too weak to keep full import of (سلخ). The challenge is beyond the simple matter of language that can be solved by a simple replacement.

In the second part of the verse (فإذا هم مظلّمون), with the use of (LO) in (and LO! They are in darkness); the English translation succeeds to convey the idea of the suddenness expressed by (فإذا).

The image behind the SM (وَأَيُّ لَهِمَّ اللَّيْلُ نَسْلَخَ مِنْهُ النَّهَارَ، فَإِذَا هُم مَّظْلَمُونَ) has been well expressed in an English style such as in Shakespeare:

The morning steals upon nights,

Melting the darkness.

*The tempest, act 5, scene 1, line 65.*

Here, steal and melt can successfully express in an English way the Arabic metaphor.

It is preferable, in this case, when a translator faces such specific metaphor in which language and culture become two major components to look for a culture correspondent to keep the same flavor and ingredients of the SM.

(ومن يكفر بالإيمان فقط حبط عمله) المائدة: 5

Pickthall: Whoso denieth the faith, his work is vain.

Yusuf Ali: if any one rejects faith, fruitless is his work.

Hilali-Khan: And whosoever disbelieves in the Oneness of Allah and in all the other Articles of Faith... then fruitless is his work.

Shakir: and whoever denies faith, his work indeed is of no account.

Sher Ali: And whoever rejects the faith, his work indeed is vain.

Khalifa: Anyone who rejects faith, all his work will be in vain.

Arberry: Whoso disbelieves in the faith, his work has failed.

Palmer: But whoso disbelieves in the faith, of a truth his work is vain.

Rodwell: Vain the works of him who shall renounce the faith.

Sale: Whoever shall renounce the faith, his work shall be vain.

This discourse here is addressed to those who have converted to another religion. Their work and faith has ended fruitless and of no importance. To express the idea of unfruitfulness, the Quaran has chosen the metaphor (حبط) which is derived from (حَبِطَ) (sweet basil), a kind of herb preferred by animals. The image behind the SM is that having grazed on sweet basil to its content, a beast affects a mortal illness beyond cure and die. The shared ground between the topic and the vehicle in this metaphor is good deed burnt into ashes: faith destroyed with conversion and the beast with self indulgence in sweet basil to surfeit. The beauty of this metaphor lies in the tragic end of both of them with prior stress on the converted person dead as an animal.

The English translation of this verse was successful in describing the uselessness of the work of a converted person, using different vehicles such as (failed, vain, fruitless, of no account); but it has failed to retain the source image which is the core and the purpose of such use.

(ولا تصعر خدك للناس) لقمان: 18

Pickthall: Turn not thy cheek in scorn toward folk.

Yusuf Ali: And swell not thy cheek (for pride) at men.

Hilali-Khan: And turn not your face away from men with pride.

Shakir: And do not turn your face away from people in contempt.

Sher Ali: And turn not thy cheek away from men in scorn.

Khalifa: You shall not treat the people with arrogance.

Arberry: Turn not thy cheek away from men in scorn.

Palmer: And twist not thy cheek proudly.

Rodwell: And distort not thy face at men.

Sale: Distort not thy face [out of contempt] to men.

This verse describes the behavior a Muslim should follow when he is walking in the street. A good believer should neither walk proudly nor turn his face away from people in contempt. To alert believers to this bad behavior, the Quran has chosen a bedwin (بدوية) metaphor (تصعر) which is taken from the Arab bedwin life.

The SM (تصعر) derives from the word (صعر), which is an illness that, affecting the animal's cheek and neck, makes the beast bend towards either left or right. When an arrogant person turns his face in pride from people, he looks like the ill animal with a curved neck affected by the aforementioned disease.

The effectiveness of this metaphor consists in bestializing this person by depicting him as a beast in a bad situation.

All the English translations were successful in describing the pride and its resulting contempt as a superficial meaning. The deep meaning, however, which represents the specificity of this SM, is missing. A cultural compensation is needed to fill the gap caused by this specificity. We can say that in this kind of metaphor the deep meaning plays the role of an argument justifying the superficial meaning.



(إذ أرسلنا عليهم الريح العقيم) الذاريات: 41

Pickthall: when we sent the fatal wind against them.

Yusuf Ali: We sent against them the devastating Wind.

Hilali-Khan: We sent against them the barren wind.

Shakir: We sent upon them the destructive wind.

Sher Ali: WE sent against them the destructive wind.

Khalifa: We sent upon them disastrous wind.

Arberry: We loosed against them the withering wind.

Palmer: we sent against them a desolating wind.

Sale: we sent against them a destroying wind.

(وَأَرْسَلْنَا الرِّيحَ لَوَاقِحَ) الحجر: 21

Pickthall: And We send the winds fertilizing.

Yusuf Ali: And We send the fecundating winds.

Hilali-Khan: And We send the winds fertilizing.

Shakir: And We send the winds fertilizing.

Sher Ali: And WE send fecundating winds.

Khalifa: And we send the winds as pollinators.

Arberry: And We loose the winds fertilising.

Palmer: And we send forth the impregnating winds.

Sale: We also send the winds driving the pregnant clouds.

In the tradition of the Holy Quran, the word (ريح) is used for the devastating wind; whereas (رياح) is used for the fertilizing wind. This tradition is also confirmed in the Hadith: (the prophet speech) states: (اللهم اجعلها رياحا ولا تجعلها ريحا) (o Allah! Make it fecundating wind not destroying one).

Through the Holy Quran (ريح) is associated with negative meaning such as

(ريحا صرصرا) فصلت 41 (freezing wind) and (الريح العقيم), but its counterpart (رياح) has a positive meaning such as 21 (الرياح لواقح) الحجر.

This nuance should be taken into consideration in any translation for two reasons: Firstly, to select an appropriate translation for each kind of wind, thus letting the target reader know the clear-cut semantic



distinction between the two and the consequent necessity to look into each individually. Secondly: to show the (إعجاز) of the Holy Quran in the sense that each single word is carefully selected and skillfully used.

An assessment of the English translation of the two aforementioned metaphors reveals that there is a considerable loss in the target text. The English translation has failed to preserve and clarify the (إعجاز) behind the two usages. Moreover, in (الريح العقيم), the SM (عقيم) has been translated by different vehicles (fatal, devastating, desolating). All of these corresponding words have failed to render the meaning of (عقيم) meant by the verse except the Hilali- khan's translation (barren).

The English translation has succeeded, therefore, to describe the disastrous aftermath of this wind but failed to draw the attention of the target reader to the main focus of the SM (عقيم) which is the literal meaning (infertile).

There is a dichotomy of meaning between the two SM (لواقح) and (عقيم), which justifies the translation of these specific metaphors by the same vehicles (fertile and infertile).

Moreover, how can we imagine that (wind) in the English translation can be at once (fertile) and (infertile)? It is precisely for dissipating such question of doubt that the Holy Quran has differentiated between (ريح) and (رياح). This lexicological distinction should be maintained in the target language through the choice of the adequate words. The words (tempest, storm) would fit to convey (ريح) since they are of disastrous and violent undertones while the word (wind) or (breeze) would reflect (رياح) because of its (gentleness)

(هن لباس لكم وأنتم لباس لهن) البقرة: 187

Pickthall: They are raiment for you and ye are raiment for them.

Yusuf Ali: They are your garments and ye are their garments.

Hilali-Khan: They are Libas [i.e. body cover, or screen, or Sakan, (i.e. you enjoy the pleasure of living with her - as in Verse 7:189) Tafsir At-Tabari], for you and you are the same for them.

Shakir: they are an apparel for you and you are an apparel for them.

Sher Ali: They are a sort of garment for you and you are a sort of garment for them.

Khalifa: They are the keepers of your secrets, and you are the keepers of their secrets.

Arberry: they are a vestment for you, and you are a vestment for them.

Palmer: they are a garment unto you, and ye a garment unto them..

Rodwell: they are your garment and ye are their garment.

Sale: they are a garment unto you, and ye are a garment unto them.

Here, in this verse, the SM describes the relationship between wife and husband. The Holy Quran was more precise in using the word (لباس) (garment) to draw the image of the closest relation between the couple.

In Arabic, the word (لباس) is used for any covering garment. It is also said that (لباس الرجل امرأته وزوجها لباسها) (the garment of a man is his wife and the reverse).

The wife is to the husband what the dress is to the body of human in that each forms a part of and gives comfort to the other. Wife and husband form one entity where they mutually please and comfort each other.

All the English translations have chosen the same vehicle (raiment, garments, apparel, and vestment) except Hilali- khan who has chosen transliteration (libas) to keep the same Arabic word. Neither the first technique nor the second one has resolved the question. The same vehicle will surely not convey the same meaning as it is explored above. Transliteration, however, keeps the situation as it is to tease the target reader to check the image behind.

In this case, the specific SM should be rendered by another metaphor which reflects the target culture and sounds more appropriate to the target language.

(فبشرهم بعذاب أليم) التوبة: 34

Pickthall: unto them give tidings (O Muhammad) of a painful doom.

Yusuf Ali: announce unto them a most grievous penalty.

Hilali-Khan: announce unto them a painful torment.

Shakir: announce to them a painful chastisement.

Sher Ali: give to them the tidings of a painful punishment.

Khalifa: promise them a painful retribution.

Arberry: give them the good tidings of a painful chastisement.

Palmer: give them glad tidings of grievous woe!

Rodwell: announce tidings of a grievous torment.

Sale: denounce a grievous punishment.

In this verse, the source metaphor is used for an ironical purpose. The use of (بشر) in Arabic is to announce good news, which is not the case here because those who hoard up gold and silver, refusing to spend it not in the way of Allah will face a painful torment.

The English translation of the SM (بشر) switches between using the same vehicle (give tidings) and different vehicle: (announce) and (promise).

The semantic field of the previous translation lacks the irony which is the major component of the SM. In order to minimize this absence in the SM and to gain the deep meaning in the TM; a translation by ground is necessary such as (O Muhammad, threaten them with a painful doom).

### **Conclusion:**

This study shows that neither the western theory scales of the mental, multidimensional, lexical, nor the Arabic theory structural measure, is of any importance during the translation act.

All the western theory classifications can not help and guide the translator towards the make-up of a theory to apply to metaphor translation. An elaboration of a model based on translation perspective would certainly be more useful in terms of theory to help the translator draw a clear-cut between techniques used for each kind of translation.

### **Bibliography**

- Bassnett, S. (1991) Translation Studies, Revised Edition. Routledge.  
Beekman, J and Callow, J. (1974) Translating the Word of God, Grand rapids, Mich: zondervan.  
Bell, R. (1991) Translation and Translating. Longman.  
Berry, R. (1978) The Shakespearean Metaphor. The Macmillan Press LTD.  
Blake, W. (1988) Songs of Innocence and of Experience. Edited by R.B. Kennedy. Northcote house.  
Catford, J.C. (1965) A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics  
London: Oxford University Press.  
Cooper, D.E. (1986) Metaphor. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.  
Delattre, P. (1965) Comparing the Phonetic Features of English, French, German and Spanish. Julius Gros Verlag heidelberg.



- Delisle, J. (1998) *Translation Terminology*. John Benjamin publishing company.
- Dickins, J. (1998). *Extended Axiomatic Linguistics*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Dickins, J and Hervey, S and Higgins, I. (2002) *Thinking Arabic Translation*. Routledge.
- Dickins, J. (2003) *Two Models for Metaphor Translation*. Forthcoming.
- Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998) London and New York.
- English Dictionary & Thesaurus* (2002) Times Books.
- Fawcett, P. (1997) *Translation and Language*. ST Jerome Publishing, Manchester, UK.
- Fonagy, I. (1980) *La Métaphore en Phonétique*. Ohawa : Didier.
- Fonagy, I. (1983) *La Vive Voix. Essais de Psychophonétique*. Paris, Payot.
- Fowler, H.W. (1926) *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. Oxford.
- Gutt, E. A. (2000) *Translation and Relevance Cognition and Context*. ST Jerome Publication.
- Hatim, B and Mason, I. (1997) *The Translator As Communicator*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Hemingway, E. *The Old Men and The Sea*. ARROW
- House, J and Shoshana, B. (1986) *Interlingual and Intercultural communication*. Gunter Narr Verlagg Tubingen.
- House, J. (1997) *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, tūbingen.
- Howkes, T. (1972) *Metaphore*. Methven & Co LTD.
- Johnston, J. (1992) *Translation as simulacrum*. In: *Rethinking Translation*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University press.
- Lakoff, G. (1984) *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.
- Larson, M. (1984) *A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*, New York: University Press of America.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1978). Longman.
- Longman Dictionary of the English Language* (1992). Longman.
- Newmark, P (1986) *Approach to Translation*. Pergamon, Institute of English.
- Newmark, P (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. (1964a) *Towards a Science of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. and Charles, T. (1969) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nord, C. (1991) *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam- Atlanta, GA.
- Schäffner, C. (1999) *The concept of norms in translation studies*, In *Translation and Norms Multilingual Matters Ltd*. Clevedan. Philadelphia. Toronto.
- Seamus, H and Ted, H (1982) *The Rattle Bag*. Faber and Faber. London.

- Shakespeare, W. King Henry V, edited by Walter J.H. (1964). Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Shakespeare, W. Julius Caesar, edited by Dorch. T.S (1977). Methuen & co LTD.
- Shakespeare, W. Twelfth Night, edited by Lothian, J.M and. Craic, T.W (1977). London, Methuen & Go LTD.
- Shakespeare, W. Macbeth, edited by Kenneth, M (1984). Methuen London and NewYork.
- Shakespeare, W. Romeo and Juliet, edited by Blakemore,G (1984). Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Shakespeare, W. Titus Andronicus, edited by Bugene, W (1984). Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. Troilus and Cressida, edited by Kenneth, M (1984). Oxford University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. The Rape of Lucrece, in The Poems, edited by John,R (1992). Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. Venus and Adonis, in The Poems, edited by John, R (1992). Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. Much Ado About Nothing, edited by Humphreys. A.R. (1994). Routledge, London and NewYork.
- Shakespeare, W. Sonnets, edited by Katherine D, J. (1998). AS.
- Shakespeare, W. Coriolanus, edited by Philip, B. (2001). The Arden Shakespeare.
- Sommer, E and Weiss, D (1995) Metaphors Dictionary. International Thomson Publishing Company.
- Steiner, G. (1975) Aspects of Language and Translation. Oxford University Press.
- The Chambers Dictionary (1998). Chambers.
- The Oxford English Dictionary. (1989) Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Thompson, A and Thompson, J. O. (1987) Shakespeare: Meaning and Metaphor. The Harvester Press.
- Tobin, Y. (1986) Discourse variation in the use of selected 'constractive conjunctions'. in Modern Hebrew: Theoretical Hypotheses and Practical Applications with Regard to Translation.
- Toury, G. (1980) In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Wilkinson, P. R. (1993) Thesaurus of Traditional English Metaphors. Routledge.
- Wills, W. (1982). The Science of Translation. Problems and Methods. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

## المراجع بالعربية :

- تفسير القرآن العظيم: للإمام أبي الفداء والحافظ ابن كثير الدمشقي، كتب هوامشه وضبطه حسين بن إبراهيم زهران، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت- لبنان، سنة 1988 م.
- الجامع لأحكام القرآن: لابن عبد الله محمد بن أحمد الأنصاري القرطبي، دار الكتب العلمية، بيروت - لبنان، الطبعة الخامسة 1996م.
- جامع البيان عن تأويل أي القرآن: تأليف ابن جعفر محمد بن جرير الطبري، دار الفكر، بيروت 1988م.
- صفوة التفاسير: تأليف محمد علي الصابون، دار القرآن الكريم، بيروت، الطبعة الثانية 1981م.
- المعجم المفهرس لألفاظ القرآن الكريم: وضعه محمد فؤاد عبد الباقي، دار الحديث 1987م.
- المفردات في غريب القرن: تأليف أبي القاسم الحسين بن محمد المعروف بالراغب الأصفهاني، تحقيق وضبط محمد سيد كيلاني، شركة مكتبة ومطبعة مصطفى البابي الحلبي وأولاده بمصر، 1961م.